

veterans' checks get out on time. The deadline is tomorrow. Really, let us not let these veterans down. Let us get these checks out on time.

OUR TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I have watched our American forces move into Bosnia on the ground and in the air. Mr. Speaker, even though I am not happy with the mission, I am very impressed with the way our Armed Forces are handling themselves. With temperatures below freezing, fog, snow and ice, our military is operating as well-trained unit in Bosnia.

Next time that our soldiers and Air Force personnel are wearing their uniforms and equipment the way they are and the way they were trained, look at them; I am not one that has seen any Americans walking around without his or her helmet being on, and as you look, they are carrying their individual weapons, plus they are doing an outstanding job with our great airplanes in landing in the fog, ice, and snow.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that all of our personnel in Bosnia are from the all-volunteer system. They are the finest military force in the world, and it shows. Just look at them tonight on television.

WHAT REALLY WENT ON LAST NIGHT?

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the United States, the President, and Washington, DC, better understand what went on last night. The Speaker, the majority leader, and the President negotiated for 2½ hours.

We were under the impression that the President was absolutely adamant about making a deal and bringing a balanced budget now. Within 15 to 30 minutes, the vice president walked out and contradicted what the Speaker understood to be the beginning of a deal. This is *deja vu* all over again. This is exactly what happened on November 20 that we have been manipulated for now going on 30 days.

The President obviously is not interested in balancing the budget. This administration cannot be trusted. They can not keep their word. They cannot keep their promises.

And so make no mistake about it, there will be no CR until the administration proves that they can be trusted.

MAJORITY PARTY SHOULD GOVERN

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, there goes the Republican leadership again, saying they want to keep the Government shut down because they do not

get their way, and that is the problem here. The Republican majority has an obligation to keep this Government going. They are the only ones that can bring up a continuing resolution. They refuse to do so, because they do not get their way.

The President has stood strong, and he has said, "I will negotiate, I will sit down with you, but I will not negotiate away Medicare, I will not negotiate away Medicaid, the environment, and education." He is being fair. He is being strong.

But this Republican leadership, and there you heard it said very clearly, they want to keep the Government shut down and they want to hold this Government hostage. That is not what the majority party is supposed to do. They are supposed to govern. They are supposed to care about the Government and all the Government agencies and all the things that people need in order to continue functioning in this country. It is not fair. They are the problem.

THE BASIC PREMISE OF STRENGTH

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, once again I listened with great interest to my friend from New Jersey set down his parameters for what a majority party should do and offer us an interesting definition of strength. I respectfully beg to differ.

The most stirring example of strength is to keep your promise to the American people. The most stirring example of responsibility is to save this country and this Government from fiscal disaster for generations yet unborn. The most stirring example of true responsibility is to provide for our seniors by making sure that their health care is still here in 7 years, to make plans for the next generation and not just the next election.

The sad fact is that the liberals on this side of the aisle and the liberals at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue do not seem to understand that basic premise of strength.

Once again, the new majority says to our friends on the other side, join with us and govern, but let us play by the rules.

WE MUST BALANCE PRIORITIES

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, we have got some disagreements and, indeed, sometimes the rhetoric gets a little heated around here from both sides.

Let me explain, we are not just talking dollars and cents as some of our colleagues on the other side who spoke earlier. We are not talking about the fact we are a few billion dollars apart.

We are talking about balancing priorities as well as balancing the budget. There are a lot of us on our side of the aisle that say, look, if we are going to force adult children of the elderly who are in nursing homes to pick up the cost of that nursing home care because we have changed Medicaid, we have made a medigap program, we have not guaranteed that all of these senior citizens are even going to have a nursing home, we have not guaranteed the standard of care, we have not guaranteed that spouses are not going to be impoverished.

Let me tell you something, in the committee, 100 percent of the Republicans on the other side voted against each one of those amendments protecting adult children, protecting spouses from impoverishment, protecting people so that they have at least some standard of care.

I understand, in the conference report, that may have begun to change. It has not changed enough. We must protect those care standards.

WORDS FROM A PROMINENT AMERICAN POLITICIAN

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a prominent American politician:

We have to cut the deficit, because the more we spend paying off the debt, the less tax dollars we have to invest in jobs and education and the future of this country. The more money we take out of the pool available savings, the harder it is for people in the private sector to borrow money at affordable interest rates for a college loan or for their children, for a home mortgage or to start a new business. That is why we have got to reduce the debt, because it is crowding out other activities we ought to be engaged in and the American people ought to be engaged in. We cut the deficit so that our children will be able to buy a home, so that our companies can invest in the future, retaining their workers, so our government can make the kinds of investments we need to be strong and smarter and safer.

These are not the words of NEWT GINGRICH, but the words of Bill Clinton on February 2, 1993, in his budget address. He said it. We agree with it. Let us do it. Let us do it now.

AMERICA, TAKE A LOOK AT THE LOSS OF JOBS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about budget deficits. Polaroid has announced they are laying off 1,300 Americans, 1,300 more Americans losing their livable-wage jobs.

But Polaroid said, "Don't worry." They are going to join forces with the Federal Government and provide retraining. What are we retraining American workers to do? How many more

welders and auto body specialists do we need? Pantyhose crotch-closers?

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Since NAFTA, 50,000 American workers have lost their jobs. Just last week Boeing laid off 3,200 Americans, moved to Mexico. They were making \$18 an hour in Seattle. They will make 76 cents in Mexicali.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are talking about balancing the budget? America and Congress will never balance the budget with jobs at Mickey D's.

It is time to take a look at the loss of jobs, ladies and gentlemen.

GET RID OF SECRETARY O'LEARY

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to try to achieve a balanced budget, I think we ought to keep in mind the one Cabinet Secretary who has been singled out by Vice President GORE for doing, and I quote the Vice President, "a fabulous job on eliminating unnecessary spending." Yes, I am talking about the administration's poster child for government frugality, Hazel O'Leary.

How can we be so callous, so down-right mean-spirited, Mr. Speaker, as to work for a balanced budget at a time when the Secretary of Energy already may be going a whole night or two without staying in a 5-star European hotel at taxpayer expense?

The Vice President insists that she is doing, in his words, a fabulous job. But here is a question: The law clearly states in title 5, section 3107, that a Cabinet Secretary may not use appropriated funds to pay a publicity expert unless the money has been appropriated specifically for that purpose. Was that law violated by Mrs. O'Leary when she used taxpayer dollars to hire a private PR firm?

Let us look into that. Let us balance the budget. Let us get rid of Secretary O'Leary.

□ 1015

GET ECONOMIC HOUSE IN ORDER

(Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the Republicans took over this House in January, they said they would run this Government like a business. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am still looking for the business that would run this Government like the Republicans are running it. They are sending home workers because they are upset they are not getting their own way, and in the end they are going to pay them. I would like to see one business, just one business in this country, that is going to send home its employees because it is so mad it is not getting its own way,

and then is going to pay them in the end.

There is no reason to send these people home. They should work if they want to work. And why are they sending them home? They are not getting their own way, because President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress are saying "No, we don't want seniors' monthly premiums for Medicare to raise at four times the rate of inflation. We think that is wrong. And we think it is wrong that you have tax cuts that disproportionately go to the richest people in this country."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, some day we should have a tax cut, but we should not have the hot fudge sundae until after we eat the vegetables. Let us get our economic house in order first, and then let us talk about tax cuts.

AFL-CIO SPENDING UNION MONEY TO ATTACK BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the Republican effort to balance the budget have made a number of attempts to frighten the American people. It began with medi-scare, continued with edu-scare, and now it culminates with union-scare. The Washington based leadership of the AFL-CIO intends to spend \$22 million on a campaign that attacks Republican efforts to balance the budget. Their campaign, however, is not based on the facts of the Republican plan to balance the budget, but rather on a series of lies, half-truths, and distortions.

The interesting part of this campaign is that the \$22 million is being financed by dues, fees, fines, and other special assessments on the hardworking men and women who are members of the AFL-CIO and their affiliate unions. Moreover, it is also important to note that this money is not being spent to further the interests of the union members, but rather is being spent to advance the political interests and agenda of the AFL-CIO's newly elected leadership. I wonder if the men and women who are paying for this campaign would support the use of their \$22 million, if they were aware that it was being used to advance purely political objectives that stand in the way of a balanced Federal budget and brighter future for all Americans.

BALANCED BUDGET PLAN AFFECTS RETIREES

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, what this budget debate is all about is the Republican plan to give a \$253 billion tax break to wealthy individuals and to repeal the minimum corporate tax. And where does the GOP balanced budget plan leave real people, like Mrs. Johnson, who wrote to me and said:

I will be 65 years old next month, but have been disabled for 9 years. At this point in time I'm very concerned about what will happen to me and my husband when changes in Medicare are made. My check is for \$332, which doesn't cover the cost of the supplemental health insurance. My husband's check is \$670 a month. At present he is quite ill and in the VA hospital.

We tried to save for our retirement years, but I had to quit my job as a nursing assistant because of many health problems. This means we have spent more just to get by than we have in income. At this rate, our small savings will not go too far. I don't know what the answers are to these problems, but I desperately hope a solution can be found that won't make life harder.

BALANCING RIGHTS OF ALL PARTIES IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(Mr. FAWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, in two hearings earlier this year, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities heard from witnesses who shared their experiences with so-called "union salters." In many cases, paid union organizers, known as salters, sought employment simply to disrupt the employer's workplace or to force the employer out of business or to defend itself against frivolous charges filed with the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB]. For most of these companies—many of which were smaller businesses—the economic harm inflicted by the union's salting campaigns was devastating.

Mr. Speaker, last month the Supreme Court issued a decision that such salters were nevertheless employees under the National Labor Relations Act [NLRA] and thus entitled to all rights and protections of that act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that any employer is entitled to know that its employees are loyal employees not being paid by others to be destructive to its business. I am therefore exploring legislative alternatives for curbing the abusive practices involved with salting. The Court's decision notwithstanding, we must retain and ensure the balance of rights of employers and employees that is fundamental to the system of collective bargaining.

FAMILY FRIENDLY CONGRESS

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, welcome to the family friendly Congress. If you are a Federal employee, say, at NASA, tell the kids "Sorry, no Christmas. Dad is out of work. Santa ain't coming. The grinch stole Christmas."

If you are a tourist visiting the Smithsonian with your kids, sorry, no Air and Space Museum. But what about buying a coin?

If you are a veteran, sorry, no Veterans Administration.